arXiv:1611.03573v2 [math.CA] 12 Jan 2017

Asymptotic expansions of the inverse of the Beta distribution

Dimitris Askitis*

Department of Mathematical Sciences
University of Copenhagen

January 16, 2017

Abstract

In this paper, we shall study the asymptotic behaviour of the p-inverse of the Beta distribution, i.e. the quantity q defined implicitly by $\int_0^q t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}\mathrm{d}t = pB(a,b)$, as a function of the first parameter a. In particular, we study the monotonicity and limits of $q(a)$, as well as of $\varphi(a) = -a\log q(a)$ and we derive asymptotic expansions of φ and q at 0 and ∞. Moreover, we prove some general results on p-inverses, with some interest on their own and we provide some relations between Bell and Nørlund Polynomials, a generalisation of Bernoulli numbers. Finally, we provide Maple and Sage algorithms for computing the terms of the asymptotic expansions.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 41A60; Secondary 33B15, 60E05, 11B68
Keywords: median, beta distribution, asymptotic expansion

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Granted a probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}$, its median is defined as the value $m \in \mathbb{R}$ that leaves exactly half of the "mass" of the distribution on its left and half on its right. Instead of requiring that m splits the mass exactly in two equal parts, one may choose a $p \in [0,1]$ and define the more general notion of the p-inverse value of the probability distribution:

Definition 1 *Let F be a cumulative distribution function on some subset $I \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $p \in [0,1]$. A p-inverse of F is a point $q \in I$ such that $F(q) = p$. If $p = 1/2$, a $1/2$-inverse value is called median.*

*email: dimitrios@math.ku.dk

For an arbitrary probability distribution on $\mathbb{R}$, not always do p-inverse values exist, neither do they have to be unique, but for a distribution with density wrt to Lebesgue measure p-inverse values always exist, as then the distribution function is continuous and increasing, and if furthermore the density is a.e. non-zero, they are also unique, as the distribution function shall be strictly increasing.

One point of interest has been the study of the p-inverses, including medians, of a parametrised family of probability distributions as a function of the parameter, given a fixed value of p. Such a function is well defined if the distribution has density wrt to the Lebesgue measure which is a.e. non-zero. Questions that may arise in this context have to do with analyticity, monotonicity, geometric properties and approximations, in particular asymptotic expansions, of the implicit function $q(a)$ defined by an equation of the form $F_a(q(a)) = p$, where F_a is a family of commulative distribution functions. Because of the implicit definition, the study of its properties can be challenging. An example is the median of the gamma distribution, which has been studied in several occasions, for example in [6], [4], and many connections have been found, for example with the Ramanujan's rational approximation of e^x, see [2], [7] and [1], while in [5] it was also proved that it is is a convex function.

In this paper, considering p fixed in $(0, 1)$, we focus on studying the p-inverse of the beta distribution, i.e. the distribution on $[0, 1]$ with the density function $t \mapsto t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}$, as a function of the parameter a considering b fixed. In the last section we indicate how the results can be translated to consider the median as a function of b, with a fixed. The p-inverse of the beta distribution has been considered by Temme in [14], who studied the asymptotic behaviour of the p-inverse (or in his notation, the inverse of the normalised beta incomplete function) under restrictions over relations between the two parameters of the beta distribution. Also, see [13] for some inequalities on the median.

In the second session we shall also give some more general results and then apply them to the case of the beta distribution, but which also have an interest on their own. For example, Lemma 2.2 can be viewed as a generalisation of results on quotients of series, and its corollary, Lemma 2.3, can be applied to more general probability distributions.

The p-inverse of the beta distribution, as a function of the first parameter, is defined as:

Definition 2 *Fix $p \in (0, 1)$ and $b \in (0, +\infty)$. The function $q : (0, +\infty) \to (0, 1)$ defined implicitly by*

$$\int_0^{q(a)} t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}dt = p \int_0^1 t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1}dt \tag{1.1}$$

is called the p-inverse of the beta distribution with parameters a and b.

As in [4] for the case of the median of the gamma distribution, to study the p-inverse we consider and study an auxilliary function related to its logarithm

$$\varphi(a) := -a \log q(a) \tag{1.2}$$

and it will become clear that studying the logarithm gives more information on the behaviour of the p-inverse. One may also consider φ itself as the $(1-p)$-inverse of some distribution. Indeed, using change of variables in (1.1)

$$\int_0^{\varphi(a)} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1}\mathrm{d}s = (1-p)\int_0^{\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1}\mathrm{d}s \tag{1.3}$$

Later, Bernoulli numbers and a generalisation of them known as Nørlund polynomials will become useful. The Bernoulli numbers B_n are classically defined through their generating function

$$\frac{x}{e^x-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \frac{x^n}{n!} \tag{1.4}$$

They can be generalised to the Bernoulli polynomials $B_n(t)$, defined similarily through the generating function

$$\frac{xe^{tx}}{e^x-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n(t) \frac{x^n}{n!} \tag{1.5}$$

Another generalisation of Bernoulli numbers are the Nørlund polynomials $B_n^{(s)}$ defined through the generating function

$$\left(\frac{x}{e^x-1}\right)^s = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n^{(s)} \frac{x^n}{n!} \tag{1.6}$$

They are polynomials in s. If $s \in \mathbb{N}$, then $B_n^{(s)}$ is the s-fold convolution of Bernoulli numbers. An account on Nørlund polynomials can be found in [8, 24.16] and references within. Bernoulli and Nørlund appear often when we consider asymptotic expansions of the gamma and related functions (see e.g. [15].

1.2 Main results

The first results are the following propositions, which are proved in section 3. In the rest, γ_b denotes the $(1-p)$-inverse of the gamma distribution with parameter b.

Proposition 1 *The p-inverse of the beta distribution $q(a)$ is a real analytic, increasing function of a. It has limits*

$$\lim_{a\to 0} q(a) = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{a\to \infty} q(a) = 1$$

Proposition 2 *The function $\varphi(a) = -a \log q(a)$ is real analytic and increasing for $b > 1$, constant for $b = 1$ and decreasing for $b < 1$. It has limits*

$$\lim_{a \to 0} \varphi(a) = \log p \tag{1.7}$$

and

$$\lim_{a \to \infty} \varphi(a) = \gamma_b \tag{1.8}$$

To study the asymptotic behaviour of q and φ in more depth, we shall try to find the asymptotic expansions of φ at 0 and ∞. Studying asymptotic expansions of implicit functions can be highly non-trivial, as the method and the obstacles arising depend much on the form of the defining implicit relation. For the p-inverse of the beta distribution, we consider the cases of asymptotic expansions of φ centered at 0 and at ∞. In both cases, we shall combine differentiation and Faà di Bruno's formula (4.10), and the existence of the expansion has to be proved inductively.

For the case of 0, we shall compute the limits of the derivatives. For the case of ∞, for the same purpose, we shall introduce the differential operator D defined by

$$Df(x) = x^2 \partial f(x)$$

where ∂ denotes the common differentiation operator. The calculus of D is studied in subsection 5.1.

This operator has the importance that it can give, under certain conditions, the asymptotic expansion of a suitably smooth function at infinity, which is summarized in the following lemma, which is proved in subsection 5.1:

Lemma 1.1 *Let $f \in C^n(0, \infty)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the following hold:*

i. If $\lim_{x \to \infty} D^m f(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$ for all $m \leqslant n$, we have the asymptotic expansion

$$f(x) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{c_k}{x^k} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{x^n}\right)$$

where

$$c_k = \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \lim_{a \to \infty} D^k f(a), \quad m < n$$

ii. Assume, conversely, that f has asymptotic expansion of order n, i.e. $f(x) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{c_k}{x^k} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{x^{n+1}}\right)$, as well as that its derivatives $f^{(m)}$ admit asymptotic expansions of orders $m+n$, for $m \leqslant n$. Then, we have

$$c_k = \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \lim_{a \to \infty} D^k f(a)$$

We note that, if conditions in *i.* hold, we may apply the lemma to $D^k f$ and get asymptotic expansions of higher derivatives, hence the expansion in *i.* can be differentiated. Also, if in the previous lemma $f \in C^\infty(0,\infty)$ and its conditions hold for all n, then we may get the whole asymptotic expansion of f.

Regarding the functions φ and q, we have the following two pairs of theorems and Corollaries on their asymptotic expansions, which are proved in sections 4 and 5 respectively. In the following, $\Psi(n,z) := \partial^{n+1} \operatorname{Log}\Gamma(z)$ denotes the polygamma function. Also, $(m)_n$ denotes the Pochhammer symbol of m, i.e. $(m)_n = m(m+1)\dots(m+n-1)$. If $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then we have $(m)_n = \frac{(m+n-1)!}{(m-1)!}$, and $(-m)_n = (-1)^n \frac{m!}{(m-n)!}$ if $n \leqslant m$, and $(-m)_n = 0$ if $n > m$. These identities will be widely used in the next sections.

Theorem 1 *The function φ admits the asymptotic expansion $\varphi(a) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n a^n$ at 0, with $c_0 = \log p$ and*

$$c_n = \frac{\Psi(n-1,b) - \Psi(n-1,1)}{n!} = \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n!} \int_0^\infty u^{n-1} \left(\frac{e^{-u} - e^{-bu}}{1-e^{-u}} \right) \mathrm{d}u, \quad n \geqslant 1$$

For $b \in \mathbb{N}$, we have in particular

$$c_n = (-1)^{n+1}(n-1)! \sum_{k=1}^{b-1} \frac{1}{k^n} \tag{1.9}$$

Corollary 1 *An approximation for φ for values of a close to 0 is*

$$\varphi(a) \sim \log \frac{\Gamma(a+b)}{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)} - \log p$$

and for q

$$\frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}} \sim \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+b)}{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)} \right)^{1/a}$$

each having a remainder term vanishing faster than a^n at 0, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, we have the asymptotic expansion

$$\frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}} \sim e^{-\gamma - \Psi(0,b)} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{B}_n(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)}{n!} a^n \right) \tag{1.10}$$

where γ is the Euler constant, $c_n = \frac{\Psi(n-1,b) - \Psi(n-1,1)}{n!}$ and $\mathcal{B}_n$ denotes the nth complete Bell polynomial (see Remark 4.1).

Theorem 2 *The function φ admits the asymptotic expansion*

$$\varphi(a) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varphi_n \frac{(-1)^n}{n! a^n}, \quad a \to \infty$$

at ∞, with φ_n satisfying the system of recursive relations

$$\varphi_n = -\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\binom{n-1}{j}\varphi_{n-j}\delta(0,j,0) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\varphi_{k-j+1}\delta(0,j,n-k-1) + B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k\gamma_b^{n-k} \tag{1.11}$$

$$\delta(k,m,n) = \delta(k,m-1,n+1) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{j}\varphi_{m-j}\delta(k+1,j,n) \tag{1.12}$$

and the initial conditions

$$\varphi_0 = \gamma_b \tag{1.13}$$

$$\delta(k,0,n) = B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}(-1)^{k-j}(b+n-j)_j\gamma_b^{n-j} \tag{1.14}$$

The recursive relations (1.11) and (1.12) in the foregoing lemma work inductively. We know φ_0 and once we have computed $\varphi_0,\ldots,\varphi_{n-1}$, in order to compute φ_n we use (1.11), where the maximum of the second argument of δ that is at most $n-1$, and we can compute these terms using (1.12) and the initial conditions, as φ_k appears there in orders at most equal to the second argument of δ, and that we already have computed. This algorithm can give us the first terms of the asymptotic expansion:

$$\varphi(a) = \gamma_b - \frac{\gamma_b(b-1)}{2a} + \frac{\gamma_b(-1+b)\,(7\,b+\gamma_b-5)}{24a^2} - \frac{\gamma_b(-1+b)^2\,(3\,b+\gamma_b-1)}{16a^3} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{a^4}\right) \tag{1.15}$$

Also, for q we then get:

Corollary 2 *For $a\to\infty$, an asymptotic expansion for q is*

$$q(a) \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\frac{\mathcal{B}_n(-\varphi_0,2\varphi_1,-3\varphi_2,\ldots,(-1)^n n\varphi_{n-1})}{n!}\frac{1}{a^n} \tag{1.16}$$

where φ_n is the sequence defined in Theorem 2.

In section 6 we briefly state how these results translate if we consider the p-inverse as a function of the second parameter of the beta distribution, keeping the first parameter fixed. In section 7 we state some relations between Nørlund, Bernoulli and Bell polynomials that we came upon and we could not find in the literature. These relations come out by considering the coefficients of Bernoulli generating functions as taylor coefficients, i.e. as limits of derivatives, and using Faà di Bruno's formula, and its relation to Bell polynomials, to compute these derivatives. Finally, in the appendix we implement the recursive relations of Theorem 2 as Maple and Sage algorithms and give coefficients of asymptotic expansions for some specific values.

2 General results

This section consists of general results about the p-inverses of probability distributions, for a fixed $p \in (0,1)$. It begins with a generalisation of [11, Lemma 2.2], regarding the monotonicity of ratios of functions defined by certain integrals, and the result is applied to the monotonicity of the p-inverse in Lemma 2.3.

The following lemma is a standard result in measure theory, that lets us interchange integration and differentiation, and we state it for the reader's convenience. In the rest of the paper, ∂_x denotes differentiation with respect to a variable x.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ be a measure space, $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ an open interval and $f : I \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ a function such that:*

i. $a \mapsto f(a,t)$ *is differentiable for μ-a.e. $t \in \Omega$*

ii. $t \mapsto f(a,t)$ *is μ-integrable for all $a \in I$*

iii. $\exists g \in L^1(\Omega, \mathrm{d}\mu)$ *such that $|\partial_a f(a,t)| \leqslant g(t)$ for all $a \in I$ and μ-a.e. $t \in \Omega$*

Then, the function $a \mapsto \int_\Omega f(a,t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)$ is differentiable and

$$\partial_a \int_\Omega f(a,t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) = \int_\Omega \partial_a f(a,t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)$$

Lemma 2.2 *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval, $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ a non-empty Borel set, μ a σ-finite Borel measure on A and $u, v : A \to [0, +\infty)$ measurable functions, not simultaneously* 0.
Let $f : I \times A \to (0, +\infty)$ such that

i. $a \mapsto f(a,t)$ *is differentiable for μ-a.e. $t \in A$*

ii. $t \mapsto u(t)f(a,t)$ *and* $t \mapsto v(t)f(a,t)$ *are μ-integrable for all $a \in I$.*

iii. For each compact subset $K \subset I$, there exists a function $g_K : A \to [0, +\infty)$ such that ug_K, vg_K are μ-integrable and $|\partial_a f(a,t)| \leqslant g_K(t)$ for all $a \in K$ and μ-a.e. $t \in A$.

Let $F : I \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by:

$$F(a) := \frac{\int_A f(a,t)u(t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)}{\int_A f(a,t)v(t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)} \tag{2.1}$$

Then, the following hold:

I. If, $\forall a \in I$ and for μ-a.e. t, the logarithmic derivative of f wrt a, $\partial_a f(a,t)/f(a,t)$, and the ratio $u(t)/v(t)$ both increase or both decrease wrt t, then F is increasing.

II. If, $\forall a \in I$ and for μ-a.e. t, the logarithmic derivative of f wrt a, $\partial_a f(a,t)/f(a,t)$, increases (decreases) wrt t and the ratio $u(t)/v(t)$ decreases (increases), then F is decreasing.

Proof Let $U(a) = \int_A f(a,t)u(t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)$, $V(a) = \int_A f(a,t)v(t)\mathrm{d}\mu(t)$. By the fact that $u(a)\partial_a f(a,t)$ and $v(t)\partial_a f(a,t)$ are dominated in compact subsets of I by a μ-integrable function of t, Lemma 2.1 gives that both U and V are differentiable, and the derivatives can be given by differentiating the integrands. Then, F' also exists and hence we need to investigate the derivative

$$F'(a) = \frac{U'(a)V(a) - U(a)V'(a)}{V^2(a)}$$

We find

$$\begin{aligned}
&U'(a)V(a) - U(a)V'(a) = \\
&= \int_A \int_A u(s)v(t)\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t)\mathrm{d}\mu(s)d\mu(t) \\
&\quad - \int_A \int_A u(s)v(t)f(a,s)\partial_a f(a,t)\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&= \int_A \int_A u(s)v(t)(\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t) - \partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s))\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&= \int_A \int_{A\cap\{s<t\}} u(s)v(t)(\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t) - \partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s))\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&\quad + \int_A \int_{A\cap\{s>t\}} u(s)v(t)(\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t) - \partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s))\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&= \int_A \int_{A\cap\{s<t\}} u(s)v(t)(\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t) - \partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s))\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&\quad + \int_A \int_{A\cap\{s<t\}} u(t)v(s)(\partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s) - \partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t))\mathrm{d}\mu(s)\mathrm{d}\mu(t) \\
&= \int_A \int_{A\cap\{s<t\}} (u(s)v(t) - u(t)v(s))\left(\partial_a f(a,s)f(a,t) - \partial_a f(a,t)f(a,s)\right)\mathrm{d}\mu(s)d\mu(t)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the prelast equality we have made use of Fubini's theorem for σ-finite measures. The last integrand, as $s < t$, is non-negative (non-positive) if $\partial_a f/f$ and u/v have the same (opposite) monotonicity properties, which proves the lemma. □

Remark 2.1 In the proceeding Lemma, the same conclusion holds if u, v can assume the value zero at the same time, as then, without loss of generality, we can just integrate over the set $A' = A\backslash(\{u(t) = 0\} \cap \{v(t) = 0\})$, which is again a Borel set, and we consider the condition u/v being increasing (or decreasing) in A'.

Remark 2.2 Lemma 2.2 is a general case of results concerning monotonicity properties of ratios of power series, polynomials etc. For instance, it gives Lemma 2.2 from [11], if we set μ being the counting measure on $\mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.3 *Let I, J be two open intervals. Let $f : I \times J \to (0, \infty)$ such that:*

i. $a \mapsto f(a, x)$ *is differentiable for all* $x \in J$

ii. $x \mapsto f(a, x)$ *is integrable for all* $a \in I$

iii. For each compact subset $K \subset I$, there exists an integrable function $g_K : J \to [0, +\infty)$ such that $|\partial_a f(a, t)| \leqslant g_K(t)$ for all $a \in K$ and μ-a.e. $t \in A$.

iv. The logarithmic derivative of f wrt a is increasing (decreasing) wrt x, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial_a f(a, x)}{f(a, x)} \uparrow_x (\downarrow_x)$$

Then, the p-inverse $q(a)$ of the probability distribution with density function $f(a, x)/\int_J f(a, t)dt$ is increasing (decreasing) wrt a.

Proof We will deal with the case that the logarithmic derivative of f is increasing, and the other case, that it is decreasing, is analogous. Let $x \in J = (c, d)$, where $-\infty \leqslant c < d \leqslant +\infty$. Then the cumulative distribution function is

$$F(a; t) = \frac{\int_c^x f(a, t)dt}{\int_c^d f(a, t)dt} = \frac{\int_c^d f(a, t)1_{[c,x]}(t)dt}{\int_c^d f(a, t)dt}$$

Hence, setting $u(t) = 1_{[c,x]}(t)$ and $v(t) = 1$, as $u/v = u \downarrow t$, by Lemma 2.2 we get that, as $\partial_a f/f$ increases, the cumulative distribution decreases pointwise wrt a, i.e. we get that

$$\frac{\int_c^{q(a+h)} f(a, t)dt}{\int_c^d f(a, t)dt} \geqslant \frac{\int_c^{q(a+h)} f(a + h, t)dt}{\int_c^d f(a + h, t)dt} = p = \frac{\int_c^{q(a)} f(a, t)dt}{\int_c^d f(a, t)dt}$$

which then implies that $q(a+h) \geqslant q(a)$ and hence that the p-inverse is increasing. □

Remark 2.3 In Lemma 2.2, if the logarithmic derivative $\partial_a f/f$ is strictly monotone (and $u \not\equiv v$), it is easy to see from the proof that in the conclusion the ratio of the integrals should also be strictly monotone. Hence, also in Lemma 2.3, if the logarithmic derivative is strictly increasing (decreasing), then the p-inverse is also strictly increasing (decreasing).

The following Lemma deals with the question of convergence of the p-inverses of a convergent net of probability distributions. We assume the topology of the extended real line $\hat{\mathbb{R}}$ where a local base of the neighborhoods of $\pm\infty$ are in the form $[-\infty, \alpha)$ and $(\alpha, +\infty]$. When we denote a neighborhood in this extended topology by $\hat{U}$, then we denote the respective set without the infinities by $U = \hat{U} \cap \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 2.4 *Let A be a directed set and $F : A \times \mathbb{R} \to [0,1]$ a net wrt a of cumulative distribution functions of x with respective densities $f(a;t)$ such that*

i. The net $(F(a;x))_{a\in A}$ converges pointwise to a limit $F_\infty(x) := \lim_a F(a;x)$

ii. For each $w \in \widehat{\mathbb{R}}$, there is a neighbourhood $\hat{U}_w$ and an integrable function $g_w : U_w \to [0,\infty)$ such that $f(a;x) \leqslant g_w(x)$ for all $a \in A$ and $x \in U_w$

iii. There is a unique $q_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_\infty(q_\infty) = p$

Let $q(a)$ be a p-inverse of $F(a;x)$, i.e. $F(a;q(a)) = p$, $\forall a \in A$. Then, $q(a) \to q_\infty$.

Proof The net $q(a)$ has at least one cluster point in $[-\infty,+\infty]$. Let q be such a point and consider the corresponding subnet that converges to it. If we prove that $q = q_\infty$, it would imply that any cluster point of $q(a)$ is equal to q_∞, hence that $\lim_a q(a) = q_\infty$. Thus, let a subnet $q(a_b) \to q$. We have

$$p = F(a_b; q(a_b)) = \int_{-\infty}^{q_\infty} f(a_b;t)dt + \int_{q_\infty}^{q} f(a_b;t)dt + \int_{q}^{q(a_b)} f(a_b;t)dt$$

We have that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{q_\infty} f(a_b;t)dt = F(a_b;q_\infty) \to F_\infty(q_\infty) = p$$

By condition ii. there is a neighbourhood $\hat{U}_q$ of q and a function $g_q \in L^1(U_q)$, such that, $\forall a \in A, x \in U_q$, $f(a;x) \leqslant g_q(x)$. Then, as $\lim_b q(a_b) = q$, for large enough b,

$$\int_{q}^{q(a_b)} f(a_b;t)dt \leqslant \int_{q}^{q(a_b)} g_q(t)dt \to 0$$

Hence we get that

$$\int_{q_\infty}^{q} f(a_b;t)dt \to 0$$

This implies that $q \in \mathbb{R}$, as if $q = -\infty$, then we would get by the above that $F_\infty(q_\infty) = \lim_b F(a_b;q_\infty) = 0$, and if $q = +\infty$, similarly, that $F_\infty(q_\infty) = 1$, which is a contradiction. But then

$$\int_{q_\infty}^{q} f(a_b;t)dt = F(a_b;q) - F(a_b;q_\infty) \Rightarrow F_\infty(q) = F_\infty(q_\infty) \Rightarrow q = q_\infty$$

by the uniqueness of q_∞. □

Remark 2.4 In the previous Lemma, if F_∞ is also a cumulative distribution function, q_∞ is its (unique) p-inverse, and the Lemma states that, under conditions i.-iii., convergence of distributions implies convergence of the p-inverses. Moreover, in case F_∞ has a non-unique p-inverse, then, by a similar argumentation as in the proof, we can see that all the limit points of a net of p-inverses of $F(a;x)$ are p-inverses of F_∞.

The following lemma is Proposition 2.2 in [4], formulated in a more general way.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval, and $(F(a;x))_{a\in I}$ be a family of cumulative probability distribution functions of x, where $x \in (c,d) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Assume that the corresponding densities $f(a;t)$ are positive and real analytic in both variables. Denote the respective p-inverses by $q(a)$. Then, the function q is also real analytic.*

Proof The function $q(a)$ is well defined as the densities are positive functions, hence the p-inverse is unique for each a. It is defined implicitly as the solution $y = q(a)$ to the equation $F(a;y) - p = 0$. As F is real analytic, by Theorem 6.1.2 in [12], which is a real analytic version of the implicit function theorem, this equation has a real analytic solution, and by the uniqueness of the p-inverse this solution must be exactly $q(a)$, hence q is real analytic □

3 Basic results on the p-inverse of the beta distribution

In this section we fix $b > 0$ and $p \in (0,1)$ and we denote

$$\beta(a;x) := x^{a-1}(1-x)^{b-1} \tag{3.1}$$

First we prove Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1 As u is real analytic, Lemma 2.5 gives real analyticity of the p-inverse. The derivative of β wrt a is

$$\partial_a \beta(a;x) = x^{a-1}(1-x)^{b-1}\log x$$

hence its logarithmic derivative is

$$\frac{\partial_a \beta(a,b;x)}{\beta(a,b;x)} = \log x$$

which is an increasing function of x and Lemma 2.3 gives us that q is also increasing. Its limits at 0 and ∞ are classical results, and they can be easily obtained by considering the limit distributions and using Lemma 2.4. □

Remark 3.1 The result in Proposition 1 is similar to the one about the median, and more generally for the p-inverses distribution, see [4].

Proof of Proposition 2 By Proposition 1 already, φ is seen to be a real analytic function. For the monotonicity results, the case $b = 1$ is clear. Assume $b > 1$. The case for $b < 1$ is similar. By using a change of variables on (1.1) we get

$$\int_{-a\log q(a)}^{+\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1}\mathrm{d}s = p\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1}\mathrm{d}s \tag{3.2}$$

and hence the function $\varphi(a) = -a \log q(a)$ is the $(1-p)$-inverse of the distribution with density function

$$\frac{e^{-x}(1-e^{-x/a})^{b-1}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1} ds} \tag{3.3}$$

We set $g(a,b;x) := e^{-x}(1-e^{-x/a})^{b-1}$. The logarithmic derivative of g wrt a is

$$\frac{\partial_a g(a,b;x)}{g(a,b;x)} = -\frac{(b-1)xe^{-x/a}}{a^2(1-e^{-x/a})}$$

The derivative of this wrt x is

$$\partial_x \left(\frac{\partial_a g(a,b;x)}{g(a,b;x)} \right) = \frac{b-1}{a^3} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{a}} \left(a\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{a}} - a + x \right) \left(-1 + \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{a}} \right)^{-2} \geqslant 0$$

as the function $x \mapsto a\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{x}{a}} - a + x$, has positive derivative for $x > 0$ and vanishes at 0. Thus, by Lemma 2.3 we have that φ is increasing.

For the asympotic results, we notice that for $a \to 0$, we have that

$$\frac{e^{-x}(1-e^{-x/a})^{b-1}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1} \mathrm{d}s} \to \frac{e^{-x}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s} \mathrm{d}s}$$

i.e. the corresponding distributions, whose p-inverses are equal to $\varphi(a)$, converge to the gamma distribution with parameter 1, and hence by Lemma 2.4 that $\lim_{a\to 0} \varphi(a) = -\log p$. Similarly, for $a \to \infty$

$$\frac{e^{-x}(1-e^{-x/a})^{b-1}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s}(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1} \mathrm{d}s} = \frac{e^{-x}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s} \frac{(1-e^{-s/a})^{b-1}}{(1-e^{-x/a})^{b-1}} \mathrm{d}s} \to \frac{e^{-x}x^{b-1}}{\int_0^{+\infty} e^{-s} s^{b-1} \mathrm{d}s} \tag{3.4}$$

hence the distribution converges to the gamma distribution with parameter b and $\lim_{a\to\infty} \varphi(a) = \gamma_b$, the $(1-p)$-inverse of the gamma distribution with parameter b. □

4 Asymptotics at 0

For computing the asymptotic expansion of φ at 0, our method consists of iterated differentiation of relations that implicitely contain the p-inverse and use Faà di Bruno's formula. Then, taking limits for $a \to 0$ and computing the limits of all the terms, we compute the limits of the derivatives which then wields the asymptotic expansion, as, if $f \in C^\infty(0,\varepsilon)$, for some $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\lim_{x\to 0} f^{(n)}(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$ for all n, denoting this limit by $f^{(n)}(0)$ we have $f \sim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(n)}(0)}{n!} x^n$. The converse is not necessarily valid: if f admits asymptotic expansion at 0 it is not necessary that the limits of the derivatives exist, as there may be oscillations. The limits of the derivatives of φ will be computed then inductively.

First, we use integration by parts in (1.1) getting

$$e^{-\varphi(a)}(1-q(a))^{b-1}+(b-1)\int_0^{q(a)}t^a(1-t)^{b-2}dt=ap\frac{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(a)}{\Gamma(a+b)}=p\Gamma(b)W(a) \tag{4.1}$$

where $W(a)=\Gamma(a+1)/\Gamma(a+b)$. This function W is studied in [3, C4], and in a generalised form in [10], where several properties, such as complete monotonicity, are proved. We consider the logarithmic derivative of W and we note that, as $\log W(a)=\log\Gamma(a+1)-\log\Gamma(a+b)$, by the integral representation of the digamma function $\Psi(0,z)$ (see [3, Theorem 1.6.1]), we get that

$$(\log W(a))'=\Psi(0,a+b)-\Psi(0,a+1)=-\int_0^\infty e^{-au}\left(\frac{e^{-u}-e^{-bu}}{1-e^{-u}}\right)\mathrm{d}u \tag{4.2}$$

We define the function ψ by

$$\psi(a):=-\log\frac{\Gamma(a+1)}{\Gamma(a+b)}-\log p\Gamma(b)=-\log W(a)-\log p\Gamma(b) \tag{4.3}$$

which implies that $e^{-\psi(a)}=p\Gamma(b)W(a)$ and (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$e^{-\varphi(a)}(1-q(a))^{b-1}+(b-1)\int_0^{q(a)}t^a(1-t)^{b-2}\mathrm{d}t=e^{-\psi(a)} \tag{4.4}$$

Hence, as $\psi\in C^\infty(-1,\infty)$, denoting the limit of the kth derivative of ψ at 0 by $\psi^{(k)}(0)$, by (4.2) we have

$$\psi^{(k)}(0)=\Psi(k-1,b)-\Psi(k-1,1)=(-1)^{k-1}\int_0^\infty u^{k-1}\left(\frac{e^{-u}-e^{-bu}}{1-e^{-u}}\right)\mathrm{d}u \tag{4.5}$$

Let denote by $\varphi^{(n)}(0)$ the right limit of $\varphi^{(n)}$ at 0, supposing it exists. We already have, combining (1.7) and (4.3), that $\varphi(0)=\psi(0)=-\log p$. Our goal is to prove that for the limits of all the derivatives of φ and ψ at 0 are the same, i.e. we have $\varphi^{(k)}(0)=\psi^{(k)}(0)$. Differentiating (4.4) we get

$$-\psi'(a)e^{-\psi(a)}+\varphi'(a)e^{-\varphi(a)}(1-q(a))^{b-1}=(b-1)\int_0^{q(a)}t^a(1-t)^{b-2}\log t\mathrm{d}t$$

We define the functions

$$\rho(a):=(1-q(a))^{b-1} \tag{4.6}$$

$$\sigma(a):=\int_0^{q(a)}t^a(1-t)^{b-2}\log t\mathrm{d}t \tag{4.7}$$

and hence the last equation can be rewritten as

$$-\psi'(a)e^{-\psi(a)}+\varphi'(a)e^{-\varphi(a)}\rho(a)=(b-1)\sigma(a) \tag{4.8}$$

We will use this equality to find the limits of the derivatives of φ. This will be done inductively, differentiating (4.8) at each step. Our strategy is, at the kth step, where we will want to compute the limit of the $k+1$ derivative, that we use the results from the previous steps about the asymptotic behaviour of φ up to the kth derivative to find the asymptotic behaviour of the derivatives of q up to k, and then use this result to find the behaviour of the derivatives of g and h up to k, so that we finally compute the limit of the $k+1$ derivative of φ. The first part will be done in the next lemmas, and the inductive proof will be given in the end of the section.

We state the following well known differentiation formulas that we will be constantly using in the rest of the two sections, see (1.4.12) and (1.4.13) in [8]: The product formula for derivation,

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^{k} f_i(x)\right)^{(n)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{j}\in\mathbb{N}^k|\sum_{i=1}^k j_i=n\}} \binom{n}{j_1, j_2, ..., j_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} f_i^{(j_i)}(x) \tag{4.9}$$

and the Faà di Bruno formula, for the derivatives of composite functions,

$$(f\circ g)^{(n)}(x) = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n|\sum_{j=1}^n jm_j=n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1!m_2!...m_n!} f^{(\sum_{j=1}^n m_j)}(g(x)) \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{g^{(j)}(x)}{j!}\right)^{m_j} \tag{4.10}$$

The latter, in case $f(x) = \log(x)$, can take the simpler form

$$(\log g(x))^{(n)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n|\sum_{j=1}^n jm_j=n\}} C_{\boldsymbol{m}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{g^{(j)}(x)}{g(x)}\right)^{m_j} \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$C_{\boldsymbol{m}} = (-1)^{1+\sum_{j=1}^n m_j} \frac{n!\left(\sum_{j=1}^n m_j - 1\right)!}{m_1!m_2!...m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{j!^{m_j}}$$

and for $f(x) = e^x$,

$$(e^{g(x)})^{(n)} = e^{g(x)} \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n|\sum_{j=1}^n jm_j=n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1!m_2!...m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{g^{(j)}(x)}{j!}\right)^{m_j} \tag{4.12}$$

Remark 4.1 Faà di Bruno formula (4.10) is related to the polynomials that are known as Bell polynomials. The (complete) Bell polynomials are defined by the relation

$$\mathcal{B}_n(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{\kappa}\in\mathbb{N}^n|\sum_{j=1}^n j\kappa_j=n\}} \frac{n!}{\kappa_1!\kappa_2!\cdots\kappa_n!} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{x_j}{j!}\right)^{\kappa_j} \tag{4.13}$$

We can express the special case (4.12) of Faà di Bruno's formula for the exponential in terms of these Bell polynomials

$$\left(e^{g(x)}\right)^{(n)} = e^{g(x)}\mathcal{B}_n(g'(x), g''(x), \ldots, g^{(n)}(x))$$

Lemma 4.1 *Let $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,*

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q(a)\log^k q(a)}{a^l} = 0 \tag{4.14}$$

Proof We have

$$\log\left(\frac{q(a)}{a^m}\right) = \log q(a) - m\log a \to -\infty$$

for $a \to 0$, as, by (1.7),

$$a(\log q(a) - m\log a) = a\log q(a) - ma\log a \to \log p$$

This implies that

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q(a)}{a^m} = 0$$

Also (1.7) gives

$$\lim_{a\to 0} a^k \log^k q(a) = \log^k p$$

Hence

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q(a)\log^k q(a)}{a^l} = \lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q(a)}{a^{l-k}} \frac{\log^k q(a)}{a^k} = 0$$

□

Lemma 4.2 *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and assume that $\lim_{a\to 0} \varphi^{(k)}(a)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$, $\forall k \leqslant N$. Then, $\forall k \leqslant N$,*

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{a^{2k} q^{(k)}(a)}{q(a)} \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R} \tag{4.15}$$

In particular, we have that

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q^{(k)}(a)}{a^m} = 0, \quad m \geqslant 0 \tag{4.16}$$

Proof For $k = 1$, as $\varphi'(a) = -\log q(a) - aq'(a)/q(a)$, we have that

$$\frac{a^2 q'(a)}{q(a)} = -a\varphi'(a) - a\log q(a) \to -\log p$$

so (4.15) holds. Assume that $1 \leqslant n < N$ and that (4.15) holds $\forall k \leqslant n$. We will prove that (4.15) holds for $k = n+1$. Indeed, using (4.11), we get, for some coefficients $c_{\boldsymbol{k}}$ and $d_{\boldsymbol{k}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
-\varphi^{(n+1)}(a) =& a(\log q(a))^{(n+1)} + (n+1)(\log q(a))^{(n)} \\
=& a \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} jk_j = n+1\}} \left[c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(\frac{q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j} \right] \\
&+ (n+1) \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n} jk_j = n\}} \left[d_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

But one can write

$$\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} jk_j = n+1\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(\frac{q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j} = \frac{q^{(n+1)}(a)}{q(a)} + \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n} jk_j = n+1\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{a^{2j} q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j}$$

hence, rearranging the equation above and multiplying each side by a^{2n+1}, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
a^{2(n+1)} \frac{q^{(n+1)}(a)}{q(a)} =& - a^{2n+1} \varphi^{(n+1)}(a) - \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n} jk_j = n+1\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{a^{2j} q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j} \\
&- a(n+1) \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n} jk_j = n\}} d_{\boldsymbol{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{a^{2j} q^{(j)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{k_j}
\end{aligned}$$

and the right hand side converges in $\mathbb{R}$ as $a \to 0$ by our induction hypothesis, proving (4.15). To prove (4.16), we see that combining this result with Lemma 4.1 gives

$$\lim_{a \to 0} \frac{q^{(k)}(a)}{a^m} = \lim_{a \to 0} \frac{a^{2k} q^{(k)}(a)}{q(a)} \frac{q(a)}{a^{m-2k}} = 0$$

□

Lemma 4.3 *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and assume that $\lim_{a \to 0} \varphi^{(k)}(a)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$, $\forall k \leqslant N$. Then, $\forall k \leqslant N$,*

$$\lim_{a \to 0} \rho^{(k)}(a) = 0, \quad k \neq 0$$

$$\lim_{a \to 0} \rho(a) = 1$$

Proof As $q(a) \to 0$, then $\rho(a) \to 1$. The nth derivative of ρ can be expressed using (4.10) as

$$\rho^{(n)}(a) = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n} jk_j = n\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} (1 - q(a))^{b-1-\sum_{j=1}^{n} k_j} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (q^{(j)}(a))^{k_j}$$

which, by Lemma 4.2 tends to 0 as $a \to 0$, as $q^{(j)}(a) \to 0$. □

Lemma 4.4 *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and assume that $\lim_{a\to 0} \varphi^{(k)}(a)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$, $\forall k \leqslant N$. Then, $\forall k \leqslant N$,*

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \sigma^{(k)}(a) = 0$$

Proof We have

$$\int_0^{q(a)} t^a (1-t)^{b-2} \log^m t \mathrm{d}t \to 0$$

as $q(a) \to 0$ and $(1-t)^{b-2} \log^m t$ is integrable near 0. Hence, $\sigma(a) \to 0$. For $n > 0$ we have

$$\sigma^{(n)}(a) = \int_0^{q(a)} t^a (1-t)^{b-2} \log^{n+1} t \mathrm{d}t + \sum_{k=1}^{n} [e^{-\varphi(a)} (1 - q(a))^{b-2} q'(a) \log^k q(a)]^{(n-k)} \tag{4.17}$$

So, it suffices to prove that

$$[e^{-\varphi(a)} (1 - q(a))^{b-2} q'(a) \log^k q(a)]^{(l)} \to 0, \quad \forall k, l \leqslant N$$

By (4.9) we can write

$$[e^{-\varphi(a)} (1 - q(a))^{b-2} q'(a) \log^k q(a)]^{(l)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}|\sum_{j=1}^{3} m_j = l\}} c_{\boldsymbol{m}} [e^{-\varphi(a)}]^{(m_1)} [(1 - q(a))^{b-2}]^{(m_2)} [q'(a) \log^k q(a)]^{(m_3)}$$

By our assumptions, $\lim_{a\to 0} [e^{-\varphi(a)}]^{(m_1)} \in \mathbb{R}$, and as in Lemma 4.3, $((1 - q(a))^{b-2})^{(m_2)}$ also converges. Finally, by (4.9), (4.10) and Lemma 4.2

$$[q'(a) \log^k q(a)]^{(m)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{n}|\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} n_j = m\}} c_{\boldsymbol{n}} q^{(n_1+1)}(a) \prod_{j=2}^{k+1} [\log q(a)]^{(n_j)} =$$

$$\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{n}|\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} n_j = m\}} c_{\boldsymbol{n}} q^{(n_1+1)}(a) \prod_{j=2}^{k+1} \sum_{\{r|\sum_{s=1}^{n_j} s r_s = n_j\}} d_{\boldsymbol{r}} \prod_{s=1}^{n_j} \left(\frac{q^{(s)}(a)}{q(a)} \right)^{r_s} =$$

$$\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{n}|\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} n_j = m\}} c_{\boldsymbol{n}} \frac{q^{(n_1+1)}(a)}{a^{2^k \prod_{j=2}^{k+1} n_j}} \prod_{j=2}^{k+1} \sum_{\{r|\sum_{s=1}^{n_j} s r_s = n_j\}} d_{\boldsymbol{r}} \prod_{s=1}^{n_j} \left(\frac{q^{(s)}(a) a^{2s}}{q(a)} \right)^{r_s} \to 0$$

which completes the proof of the Lemma. □

Proof of theorem 1 By Proposition 2 we have that $\varphi(0) = -\log p$. For the first derivative, as $\rho(0) = 1$ and $\sigma(0) = 0$, and $\varphi(0) = \psi(0) = -\log p$, we get from (4.8) that the limit $\lim_{a\to 0}\varphi'(a) = \varphi'(0)$ exists and $\varphi'(0) = \psi'(0)$. We proceed inductively. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and assume that $\lim_{a\to 0}\varphi^{(k)}(a)$ exists and $\varphi^{(k)}(0) = \psi^{(k)}(0)\ \forall k \leqslant n$. Differentiating (4.8) n times we get

$$(e^{-\psi(a)})^{(n+1)} - (e^{-\varphi(a)})^{(n+1)}\rho(a) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(e^{-\varphi(a)})^{(k+1)}\rho(a)^{(n-k)} = (b-1)\sigma^{(n)}(a)$$

and by Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 we get

$$\lim_{a\to 0}(e^{-\psi(a)})^{(n+1)} = \lim_{a\to 0}(e^{-\varphi(a)})^{(n+1)}$$

which, by formula (4.10) and the induction hypothesis, gives that the limit $\lim_{a\to 0}\varphi^{(n+1)}(a) =: \varphi^{(n+1)}(0)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$ and

$$\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} jm_j = n+1\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} e^{-\psi(0)} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1}\left(\frac{\psi^{(j)}(0)}{j!}\right)^{m_j}$$

$$= \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{k}|\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} jm_j = n+1\}} c_{\boldsymbol{k}} e^{-\varphi(0)} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1}\left(\frac{\varphi^{(j)}(0)}{j!}\right)^{m_j}$$

and as by the induction hypothesis $\varphi^{(j)}(0) = \psi^{(j)}(0)$ for $j \leqslant n$, it gives

$$\varphi^{(n+1)}(0) = \psi^{(n+1)}(0)$$

which completes the induction. To prove (1.9), the fact that

$$\log\Gamma(x+1) - \log\Gamma(x) = \log x$$

gives the functional relation for the polygamma function

$$\Psi(k, x+1) - \Psi(k, x) = \frac{(-1)^k k!}{x^{k+1}} \tag{4.18}$$

hence

$$\varphi^{(k+1)}(0) = \Psi(k, b) - \Psi(k, 1) = \sum_{n=1}^{b-1}(\Psi(k, n+1) - \Psi(k, n)) = \sum_{n=1}^{b-1}\frac{(-1)^k k!}{n^{k+1}}$$

□

Proof of Corollary 1 The fact that φ and ψ have the same asymptotic expansion at 0 implies that an approximation of φ is

$$\varphi(a) \sim \log\frac{\Gamma(a+b)}{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)} - \log p \quad \text{as } a \to 0$$

and the error decreases faster than any positive power of a. This also implies that

$$q(a) \sim \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} p^{1/a} \quad \text{as } a \to 0$$

in the sense that $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon > 0, \exists a_{n,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that $\forall a < a_{n,\varepsilon}$

$$e^{-\varepsilon a^n}\left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} p^{1/a} < q(a) < e^{\varepsilon a^n}\left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} p^{1/a}$$

hence

$$\lim_{a\to 0} \frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}} = e^{-\gamma - \Psi(0,b)} \tag{4.19}$$

γ being the Euler's constant. The RHS of the above inequality may be rewritten as

$$\frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}} < \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} + \varepsilon' a^n \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a}$$

close to 0 and for an $\varepsilon' > \varepsilon$, and the LHS

$$\left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} - \varepsilon a^n \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} < \frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}}$$

Hence

$$\frac{q(a)}{p^{1/a}} \sim \left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a}$$

with a remainder term vanishing faster than any power of a at 0. The rest comes from considering

$$\left(\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)^{1/a} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{a}\log\frac{\Gamma(a+1)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right)$$

along with Faà di Bruno formula. □

5 Asymptotics at ∞

5.1 The operator D

To find the asymptotic expansion at infinity, the previous technique has to be adjusted accordingly. First, we introduce the differential operator D defined by

$$Df(a) = a^2 \partial f(a) \tag{5.1}$$

It satisfies the product rule

$$D(fg)(a) = g(a)Df(a) + f(a)Dg(a) \tag{5.2}$$

and the composition rule

$$D(f \circ g)(a) = f'(g(a))Dg(a)$$

The last two relations combined give us the Faa di Bruno formula for D

$$D^n(f \circ g)(a) = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m} \in \mathbb{N}^n | \sum_{j=1}^n j m_j = n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1! m_2! \dots m_n!} f^{(|\boldsymbol{m}|)}(g(a)) \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{D^j g(a)}{j!} \right)^{m_j} \tag{5.3}$$

where $|\boldsymbol{m}| = \sum_{j=1}^n m_j$. Also, we have the two-arguments composition rule

$$Df(a, \varphi(a)) = D_1 f(a, \varphi(a)) + D\varphi(a) \partial_2 f(a, \varphi(a)) \tag{5.4}$$

where $D_1 f(a, b) = a^2 (\partial_1 f)(a, b)$, ∂_1 denoting differentiation wrt the first variable of a multivariate function, i.e. in our case $D_1 f(a, \varphi(a)) = a^2 (\partial_1 f)(a, \varphi(a))$. Furthermore, we remark that it acts on monomials, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, by

$$Da^m = na^{m+1}$$

and by induction

$$D^n a^m = (m)_n a^{m+n}$$

The operator D can be used to deal with asymptotic expansions at infinity. To see this, intuitively, starting from the formal power series

$$f(x) = c_0 + \frac{c_1}{x} + \frac{c_2}{x^2} + \frac{c_3}{x^3} + \dots$$

one can get

$$D^n f(x) = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{k!}{(n-k)!} \frac{c_k}{x^{k-n}}$$

If certain conditions apply and it is possible to take limits to ∞, all but the first term of the sum vanish and we get

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} D^n f(x) = (-1)^n n! c_n$$

This is rigorously treated in Lemma 1.1, which is proved below:

Proof of Lemma 1.1 To show i), we notice that if for a function f we have $\lim_{x \to \infty} f(x) = a_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Df(x) = a_1 + a_2/x + a_3/x^2 + \dots + a_{k+1}/x^k + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{k+1})$, then by integrating we get that $f(x) = a_0 - a_1/x - a_2/2x^2 - a_3/3x^3 + \dots + a_{k+1}/kx^{k+1} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{k+2})$. Next, we see that, under the assumptions of the first part of the lemma, we have that $\lim_{x \to \infty} D^{n-1} f(x) = a \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$\lim_{x\to\infty} D^n f(x) = b \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that $D^{n-1} f(x) = a + \mathcal{O}(1/x)$. Applying this observation inductively to find the asymptotic expansions of lower powers of D proves the first part of the Lemma. For the second part, we notice that as the derivatives admit asymptotic expansions, these can be obtained by differentiating the asymptotic expansion of the original function. In the same way, we may apply the operator D to the original asymptotic expansion, as D^k can be expressed as a combination of operators ∂^l for $l \leqslant k$, and take limits to ∞ to prove the second part. □

In the following subsections we shall compute the asymptotic expansion of φ using the operator D. We start with the equation

$$\int_0^{\varphi(a)} \tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s = (1-p)\frac{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)} \tag{5.5}$$

Where

$$\tau(a;s) = e^{-s}(a - ae^{-s/a})^{b-1} \tag{5.6}$$

Our method consists of acting and iterating the operator D on (5.5) and taking the limits to ∞ on both sides. So we have to see how D acts on τ and on the right hand side.

5.2 Asymptotics of the RHS

To study the right hand side of the equation (5.5), we study the asymptotics of the ratio

$$\frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)} \tag{5.7}$$

In [15], Tricomi and Erdelyi derived an asymptotic expansion for such ratios of Gamma functions, in terms of a generalisation of Nørlund Polynomials, which in our special case it may be expressed as

$$\frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)} \sim \sum_{n\geqslant 0} \frac{\Gamma(1-b)}{\Gamma(1-(b+n))}\frac{B_n^{(1-b)}}{n!a^n}, \quad x\to\infty$$

which by the reflection formula for the Gamma function can be rewritten as

$$\frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)} \sim \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!}(b)_n \frac{B_n^{(1-b)}}{a^n} \tag{5.8}$$

We shall prove the following Lemma:

Lemma 5.1 *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\lim_{a\to\infty} D^n \left((1-p)\frac{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right) = (1-p)\Gamma(b+n)B_n^{(1-b)} \tag{5.9}$$

Proof The coefficients of the asymptotic expansion (5.8), by Lemma 1.1, can be used to give the limit in (5.9), if the derivatives of the ratio also admit asymptotic expansions. Hence we shall find these asymptotic expansions of the derivatives, and also a different expression for the coefficients in the asymptotic expansion of the ratio (5.7) on the way.

The tool we shall work with is the operator D and its Faà di Bruno formula eq5.3. We denote the logarithmic derivative of the ratio (5.7) by

$$V(a) := \log \frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)} = b\log a + \log\Gamma(a) - \log\Gamma(a+b) \tag{5.10}$$

A classic result on the asymptotic expansion of $\log\Gamma$ is the following, originally proved in [9] under the superfluous restriction that $h \in [0,1]$, see also [8, 5.11.8], for fixed $h \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\log\Gamma(x+h) \sim \log\sqrt{2\pi} + \left(x+h-\frac{1}{2}\right)\log x - x + \sum_{n\geqslant 2} \frac{B_n(h)}{n(n-1)} x^{1-n}, \quad x \to +\infty \tag{5.11}$$

which has the nice property that it can also be differentiated, and give us asymptotic expansions of polygamma functions. This implies also that the derivatives of V admit asymptotic expansions. We have, asymptotically,

$$V(a) \sim \textstyle\sum_{n\geqslant 2} \frac{B_n - B_n(b)}{n(n-1)} \frac{1}{a^{n-1}} = \sum_{n\geqslant 1} \frac{B_{n+1} - B_{n+1}(b)}{n(n+1)} \frac{1}{a^n}$$

We have, then, by Lemma 1.1, that

$$\lim_{a\to\infty} D^n V(a) = (-1)^n n! \frac{B_{n+1} - B_{n+1}(b)}{n(n+1)} \tag{5.12}$$

Acting D n times on ratio (5.7) we get

$$\begin{aligned} D^n \left(\frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right) &= D^n e^{V(a)} \\ &= e^{V(a)} \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n j m_j = n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1! m_2! \dots m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{D^j V(a)}{j!}\right)^{m_j} \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

and taking limits we end up with

$$\lim_{a\to\infty} D^n \left(\frac{\Gamma(a)a^b}{\Gamma(a+b)}\right) = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n j m_j = n\}} \frac{(-1)^n n!}{m_1! m_2! \dots m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{B_{j+1} - B_{j+1}(b)}{j(j+1)}\right)^{m_j}$$

Hence, by Lemma 1.1, the derivatives of the ratio (5.7) admit asymptotic expansions at infinity, and these can be given by differentiating the asymptotic expansion (5.8). □

Remark 5.1 In the proceeding proof, we find two different ways to express the asymptotic expansion of the ratio of gamma functions, which implies a relation between Nørlund, Bernoulli and Bell polynomials we could not trace in the literature,

$$(b)_n B_n^{(1-b)} = \mathcal{B}_n(B_2(b) - B_2, B_3(b) - B_3, \ldots, B_{n+1}(b) - B_{n+1}) \tag{5.14}$$

and using the fact that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{j+1} B_{j-k+1} \frac{(j-1)!}{k!(j+1-k)!} b^k = B_{j+1}(b) - B_{j+1}$$

we get

$$(b)_n B_n^{(1-b)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m} \in \mathbb{N}^n | \sum_{j=1}^n j m_j = n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1! m_2! \ldots m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{j+1} B_{j-k+1} \frac{(j-1)!}{k!(j-k+1)!} b^k \right)^{m_j}$$

5.3 Asymptotics of the LHS

We shall first study the asymptotic behaviour of τ, defined in (5.6), through the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.2 *We have the limits*

$$\lim_{a \to \infty} D^n \tau(a; s) = B_n^{(1-b)} e^{-s} s^{b-1+n} \tag{5.15}$$

Proof We have that

$$\tau(a; s) = e^{-s}(a - a e^{-s/a})^{b-1} = e^{-s} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{a}}{1 - e^{-s/a}} \right)^{1-b} = e^{-s} s^{b-1} \left(\frac{-\frac{s}{a}}{e^{-s/a} - 1} \right)^{1-b}$$

We may write, in terms of Nørlund polynomials, by (1.6),

$$\tau(a; s) = e^{-s} s^{b-1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k^{(1-b)} \frac{(-1)^k s^k}{k! a^k} \tag{5.16}$$

and

$$D^n \tau(a; s) = e^{-s} s^{b-1} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} B_k^{(1-b)} \frac{(-1)^{k+n} s^k}{(k-n)! a^{k-n}}$$

and thus we get

$$\lim_{a \to \infty} D^n \tau(a; s) = B_n^{(1-b)} e^{-s} s^{b-1+n}$$

□

Acting D on the left hand side of (5.5) gives the expression

$$D\int_0^{\varphi(a)}\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s = D\varphi(a)\tau(a;s) + \int_0^{\varphi(a)} D\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s$$

and hence by induction, iterating D totally n times,

$$D^n\int_0^{\varphi(a)}\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} D^k(D\varphi(a)D_1^{n-k-1}\tau(a;\varphi(a))) + \int_0^{\varphi(a)} D^n\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s \tag{5.17}$$

We shall study the terms

$$D^k(D\varphi(a)D_1^{n-k-1}\tau(a;\varphi(a))) = \sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}D^{k-j+1}\varphi(a)D^j[D_1^{n-k-1}\tau(a;\varphi(a))]$$

and as

$$D^j[D_1^{n-k-1}\tau(a;\varphi(a))] = D^{j-1}[D_1^{n-k}\tau(a;\varphi(a)) + D\varphi(a)D_1^{n-k-1}\partial_2\tau(a;\varphi(a))]$$

it is important to study the terms defined as

$$d(k,m,n) := \lim_{a\to\infty} D^m[D_1^n\partial_2^k\tau(a;\varphi(a))] \tag{5.18}$$

In other words, we will compute, recursively, the limits of these terms for $a\to\infty$. We note that, as $D^n\tau(a;s)$ is an analytic function of s in some disc around 0, as seen by its power series, we can interchange differentiation wrt the second variable and the limit for $a\to\infty$, as we know that $\varphi(a)$ converges to a finite limit, provided that the convergence for $a\to\infty$ is locally uniform, which indeed is (an argument: as $a\to\infty$, the radius of convergence of the power series increase, so taking a compact set and assuming a large enough, we can use the convergence of the sequence of power series to prove this result). We have

$$D^m[D_1^n\partial_2^k\tau(a;\varphi(a))] = D^{m-1}[D_1^{n+1}\partial_2^k\tau(a;\varphi(a)) + D\varphi(a)D_1^n\partial_2^{k+1}\tau(a;\varphi(a))]$$

hence we get the recursive relation

$$d(k,m,n) = d(k,m-1,n+1) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{j}\varphi_{m-j}d(k+1,j,n) \tag{5.19}$$

where $\varphi_l = \lim_{a\to\infty} D^l\varphi(a)$, assuming that the limit is already known, and the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} d(k,0,n) &= \lim_{a\to\infty} D_1^n\partial_2^k\tau(a;\varphi(a)) = \lim_{a\to\infty}\partial_2^k D_1^n\tau(a;\varphi(a)) \\ &= B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}(-1)^{k-j}(b+n-j)_j e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1+n-j} \end{aligned}$$

As for the integral term, we have

$$\lim_{a\to\infty}\int_0^{\varphi(a)} D^n\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s = B_n^{(1-b)}\int_0^{\gamma_b} e^{-s}s^{b-1+n}\mathrm{d}s \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$\int_0^{\gamma_b} e^{-s}s^{b-1+n}\mathrm{d}s = -\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1+n-k} + (b)_n(1-p)\Gamma(b) \tag{5.21}$$

by repeated integrations by parts and the fact that $\int_0^{\gamma_b} e^{-s}s^{b-1}\mathrm{d}s = (1-p)\Gamma(b)$. We have got, then, for the left hand side that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{a\to\infty} D^n\int_0^{\varphi(a)}\tau(a;s)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad= \lim_{a\to\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} D^k(D\varphi(a)D_1^{n-k-1}f(a;\varphi(a))) + \lim_{a\to\infty}\int_0^{\varphi(a)} D^n f(a;s)\mathrm{d}s\\
&\quad= \lim_{a\to\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}D^{k-j+1}\varphi(a)D^j[D_1^{n-k-1}f(a;\varphi(a))]\\
&\qquad- B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1+n-k} + (b)_n(1-p)\Gamma(b)B_n^{(1-b)}\\
&\quad= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\varphi_{k-j+1}d(0,j,n-k-1)\\
&\qquad- B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1+n-k} + (1-p)\Gamma(b+n)B_n^{(1-b)}\\
&\quad= \varphi_n d(0,0,0) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\binom{n-1}{j}\varphi_{n-j}d(0,j,0)\\
&\qquad+\sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\varphi_{k-j+1}d(0,j,n-k-1)\\
&\qquad- B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1+n-k} + (1-p)\Gamma(b+n)B_n^{(1-b)}
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that the term $(1-p)\Gamma(b+n)B_n^{(1-b)}$ cancels exactly with the right hand side.

5.4 Conclusion

Proof of Theorem 2 Summing up, using the normalisation $\delta = \frac{d}{e^{-\gamma_b}\gamma_b^{b-1}}$, we are left with

$$\varphi_n = -\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\binom{n-1}{j}\varphi_{n-j}\delta(0,j,0) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}\varphi_{k-j+1}\delta(0,j,n-k-1) + B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(b+n-k)_k\gamma_b^{n-k}$$

and δ and φ also satisfying the recursive relation, by (5.19),

$$\delta(k,m,n) = \delta(k,m-1,n+1) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1}\binom{m-1}{j}\varphi_{m-j}\delta(k+1,j,n)$$

We have the initial conditions

$$\varphi_0 = \gamma_b$$

$$\delta(k,0,n) = B_n^{(1-b)}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}(-1)^{k-j}(b+n-j)_j\gamma_b^{n-j}$$

□

To prove Corollary 2 we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3 *Let f have asymptotic expansion*

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N}\frac{a_k}{k!x^k} + r(x)$$

where $r(x) = \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1})$. Then,

$$e^{f(x)} = e^{a_0} + e^{a_0}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\frac{\mathcal{B}_k(a_1,a_2,...,a_k)}{k!x^k} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1})$$

Proof We have

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{a_k}{k!x^k} + r(x) \Rightarrow e^{f(x) - \sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{a_k}{k!x^k}} = e^{r(x)} = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow e^{f(x)} &= e^{\sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{a_k}{k!x^k}} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1}) = e^{a_0} \prod_{k=1}^{N} e^{\frac{a_k}{k!x^k}} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1}) \\ &= e^{a_0} \prod_{k=1}^{N} \left(1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\lceil \frac{N+1}{k} - 1 \rceil} \frac{a_k^m}{m!k!^m x^{km}} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1}) \right) + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1}) \\ &= e^{a_0} \sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{\mathcal{B}_n(a_1, a_2, ..., a_n)}{n!x^n} + \mathcal{O}(1/x^{N+1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is derived by a combinatorial argument, the coefficient of $1/x^n$ being the sum of products of the form $\prod_{k=1}^{n} \frac{a_k^{m_k}}{(k!)^{m_k} m_k!}$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{n} k m_k = n$, which defines the complete Bell polynomials. □

Proof of Corollary 2 The proof is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2 and the foregoing Lemma. □

6 Dependence on the second variable

In this section we want to investigate how the p-inverse depends on the second variable of the beta distribution, and so we denote for clarity the p inverse of a beta distribution with parameters a and b by $q(a, b; p)$. We will consider a constant and try to relate it as a function of b with the previous results.

Let $I(a, b; x) = \int_0^x t^{a-1}(1-t)^{b-1} \mathrm{d}t$ denote the incomplete beta function. A simple change of variables $s = 1 - t$ gives the functional relation

$$I(a, b; x) = 1 - I(b, a; 1 - x) \tag{6.1}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} p = I(a, b; q(a, b; p)) &= 1 - I(b, a; 1 - q(a, b; p)) \\ \Rightarrow I(b, a; 1 - q(a, b; p)) &= 1 - p = I(b, a; q(b, a; 1 - p)) \end{aligned}$$

and using the uniqueness of the p-inverse we get

$$q(a, b; p) = 1 - q(b, a; 1 - p) \tag{6.2}$$

Hence, by Proposition 1, we get that q is decreasing in b and

$$\lim_{b \to 0} q(a, b; p) = 1$$

$$\lim_{b \to \infty} q(a, b; p) = 0$$

Moreover, we have

$$(1-q(a,b;p))^b = q(b,a;1-p)^b = e^{-\varphi(b;1-p)} \tag{6.3}$$

where $\varphi(b;1-p) = -b\log q(b,a;1-p)$, hence the behaviour of $q(a,b;p)$ as a function of b can also be studied similarily through the function φ.

7 Relations between Bell, Bernoulli and Nørlund Polynomials

In the course of trying to find the asymptotic expansion of φ at ∞, using Faà di Bruno formulas, we encountered identities between Bell polynomials and Nørlund polynomials, that we have not been able to trace in the literature, hence we state them in this section as a separate result.

Proposition 3 *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Then, the Nørlund polynomial $B_n^{(c)}$ can be expressed as*

$$B_n^{(c)} = \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n jm_j = n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1!m_2!\dots m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{(-1)^{j+1}cB_j}{j!j}\right)^{m_j} \tag{7.1}$$

or, phrased in terms of Bell polynomials $\mathcal{B}_n$,

$$B_n^{(c)} = \mathcal{B}_n(cB_1, -cB_2/2, 0, -cB_4/4, 0, \dots, -cB_n/n), \quad n>1 \tag{7.2}$$

Moreover, we have that

$$(c-n)_n B_n^{(c)} = (-1)^n \mathcal{B}_n(B_2(c)-B_2, -B_3(c)-B_3, \dots, (-1)^{n+1}B_{n+1}(c)-B_{n+1}) \tag{7.3}$$

Proof The last equation is derived by Remark 5.1, and the symmetries $B_n(1-x) = (-1)^n B_n(x)$ and $(1-c)_n = (-1)^n(c-n)_n$. For the rest, by (1.6) we have

$$B_n^{(c)} = \lim_{z\to 0} \partial^n \left[\left(\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)^c\right]$$

By using Faà di Bruno formula we get

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^n \left[\left(\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)^c\right] &= \partial^n \left(e^{c\log\frac{z}{e^z-1}}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)^c \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n \mid \sum_{j=1}^n jm_j = n\}} \frac{n!}{m_1!m_2!\dots m_n!} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{c}{j!}\partial^j \left(\log\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)\right)^{m_j}\end{aligned}$$

and we have the limit

$$\lim_{z\to 0}\left(\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)^c = 1$$

and

$$-z\left(\log\frac{e^z-1}{z}\right)' = -\frac{ze^z}{e^z-1}+1 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{n+1}B_n\frac{z^n}{n!}$$
$$\Rightarrow \log\frac{z}{e^z-1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{n+1}\frac{B_n}{n}\frac{z^n}{n!}$$

hence

$$\lim_{z\to 0}\partial^j\left(\log\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right) = (-1)^{j+1}\frac{B_j}{j}$$

and thus, summing up,

$$\begin{aligned} B_n^{(c)} &= \lim_{a\to 0}\partial^n\left[\left(\frac{z}{e^z-1}\right)^c\right] \\ &= \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{m}\in\mathbb{N}^n\,|\sum_{j=1}^n jm_j=n\}}\frac{n!}{m_1!m_2!\dots m_n!}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(\frac{(-1)^{j+1}cB_j}{j!j}\right)^{m_j} \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proposition. □

Appendix

In this appendix, we provide code in Maple and Sage for computing the terms of asymptotic expansion of φ and q at infinity recursively.

A Maple code

In the first algorithm, the procedure `phiinf(n)` computes what we define as φ_n in Theorem 2.

Algorithm A.1

```
norl:=proc(n,c);
            if n=0 then
            return 1;
    else
        return (-1)^n*CompleteBellB(
n,seq(-c*bernoulli(j)/j,j=1..n)
        );
    end if;
end proc;
phiinf:=proc(n) option remember;
```

```
          if n=0 then
                  return gamma[b];
          end if;
       for k from 1 to n-1 do
          phiinf(k);
       od;
       return expand(
   -add(binomial(n-1,j)*phiinf(n-j)*delta(0,j,0),j=1..n-1)
   -add(add(binomial(k,j)*phiinf(k-j+1)*delta(0,j,n-k-1)
   ,j=0..k),k=0..n-2)+norl(n,1-b)*add(pochhammer(b+n-k,k)
   *phiinf(0)^(n-k),k=0..n-1);
   end proc;
   delta:=proc(k,m,n) option remember;
          if m=0 then
                  return simplify(
   norl(n,1-b)*add(binomial(k,j)*(-1)^(k-j)*
   pochhammer(b+n-j,j)*phiinf(0)^(n-j),j=0..k)
          );
          end if;
       return simplify(delta(k,m-1,n+1)+
   add(binomial(m-1,j)*phiinf(m-j)*delta(k+1,j,n),j=0..m-1));
   end proc;
```

In the second algorithm, the procedure `qinf(n)` computes the nth coefficient of the asymptotic expansion of q in Corollary 2.

Algorithm A.2

```
qinf:=proc(b,n);
   if n=0 then
      return 1;
   else
      return CompleteBellB(
      n,seq((-1)^(k+1)*phiinf(k),k=0..n-1))/n!;
   end if;
end proc;
```

B Sage code

The function `phiinf(n)` computes what we define as φ_n in Theorem 2.

Algorithm B.1

```
gamma_b=var('gamma_b')
    b=var('b')
    def norlund(n,c):
       if n==0:
           return 1
       else:
           return
    (-1)^n*sum(bell_polynomial(n,k)([-c*bernoulli(j)/j for j in
    [1..n-k+1]]) for k in [1..n])
    @CachedFunction
    def phiinf(n):
       if n==0:
           return gamma_b
       else:
           return expand(-sum(binomial(n-1,j)*phiinf(n-j)*
    delta(0,j,0) for j in [1..n-1])-sum(sum(binomial(k,j)*
    phiinf(k-j+1)*delta(0,j,n-k-1) for j in [0..k]) for k
    in [0..n-2])+norlund(n,1-b)*sum(rising_factorial(b+n-k,k)*
    phiinf(0)^(n-k) for k in [0..n-1]))
    @CachedFunction
    def delta(k,m,n):
                if m==0:
           return
    simplify(norlund(n,1-b)*sum(binomial(k,j)*(-1)^(k-j)*
    rising_factorial(b+n-j,j)*phiinf(0)^(n-j) for j in [0..k]))
            else:
           return
    simplify(delta(k,m-1,n+1)+sum(binomial(m-1,j)
    *phiinf(m-j)*delta(k+1,j,n)
    for j in [0..m-1]))
```

The function `qinf(n)` computes the nth coefficient of the asymptotic expansion of q in Corollary 2.

Algorithm B.2

```
    def qinf(n):
            return sum(bell_polynomial(n,j)(
            [(-1)^(k+1)*phiinf(k)
    for k in [0..n-j]]) for j in [1..n])/factorial(n)
```

References

[1] J. A. Adell and P. Jodr. On a Ramanujan equation connected with the median of the gamma distribution. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360:3631–3644, 2008.

[2] Sven Erick Alm. Monotonicity of the difference between median and mean of gamma distributions and of a related ramanujan sequence. *Bernoulli*, 9(2):351–371, 2003.

[3] George E. Andrews, Richard Askey, and Ranjan Roy. *Special Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 1999. Cambridge Books Online.

[4] Christian Berg and Henrik L. Pedersen. The chen-rubin conjecture in a continuous setting. *Methods and Applications of Analysis*, 13, 2006.

[5] Christian Berg and Henrik L. Pedersen. Convexity of the median in the gamma distribution. *Ark. Mat.*, 46, 2008.

[6] Jeesen Chen and Herman Rubin. Bounds for the difference between median and mean of gamma and Poisson distributions. *Stat. Probab. Lett.*, 4:281–283, 1986.

[7] K. P. Choi. On the medians of gamma distributions and an equation of ramanujan. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 121(1):245–251, 1994.

[8] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. http://dlmf.nist.gov/, Release 1.0.12 of 2016-09-09. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller and B. V. Saunders, eds.

[9] M. Ch. Hermite. Sur la fonction log(a). *Journ. Reine Angew. Math. (Crelles Journal)*, 115:201–208, 1895.

[10] D. B. Karp and E. G. Prilepkina. Completely monotonic gamma ratio and infinitely divisible h-function of fox. *Computational Methods and Function Theory*, 16(1):135–153, 2015.

[11] Stamatis Koumandos and Henrik L. Pedersen. On the asymptotic expansion of the logarithm of barnes triple gamma function. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 105, 2009.

[12] S.G. Krantz and H.R. Parks. *The Implicit Function Theorem: History, Theory, and Applications*. Birkhäuser, 2002.

[13] Mark E. Payton, Linda J. Young, and J. H. Young. Bounds for the difference between median and mean of beta and negative binomial distributions. *Metrika*, 36(1):347–354, 1989.

[14] N.M. Temme. Asymptotic inversion of the incomplete beta function. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 41(1):145 – 157, 1992.

[15] F. G. Tricomi and A. Erdlyi. The asymptotic expansion of a ratio of gamma functions. *Pacific J. Math.*, 1(1):133–142, 1951.